REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 13, 25 and 30 has been amended. Claims 1 – 32 are currently pending.

The present application was discussed at an interview with the Examiner on September 7, 2006. Applicants thank the Examiner for agreeing to the interview, and the present remarks reflect the amendments discussed at the interview.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkin, U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0181776 ("Atkin"). Applicants have amended the independent claims and respectfully submit that Atkin does not teach or suggest "notifying an application of said input event by providing said application a sentinel value when the text converting component is interested in performing said conversion action," as required by amended independent claim 1. Similarly, Atkin does not teach or suggest preventing "an application from handling said user input event by providing a sentinel value to_said application when one or more of said text converting components are interested in performing a conversion action," as required by independent claims 25, 13 and 30.

Atkin discloses a system for providing Unicode support in legacy operating systems. Atkin, Abstract. Because legacy operating systems may not be equipped to handle a wide variety of languages, the system of Atkin includes an input method editor (IME) configured to convert an input into its Unicode value. An application that is Unicode capable can then receive the Unicode value corresponding to an input and can make use of the input. As explained by Atkin, "In this way, the operating system is bypassed so that the operating system

need not be equipped with an input method editor in order for Unicode to be used with a Unicode

capable application." Atkin, para. 10.

        As previously mentioned, independent claim 1 requires "notifying an application

of said input event by providing said application a sentinel value when the text converting

component is interested in performing said conversion action." Further, independent claims 13,

25 and 30 require preventing "an application from handling said user input event by providing a

sentinel value to said application when one or more of said text converting components are

interested in performing a conversion action."

        Providing a non-Unicode input to an application does not teach or suggest the

claim elements at issue for at least three different reasons. First, providing an application a non-

Unicode input in no way teaches "providing said application a sentinel value." When an active

application is not Unicode capable, Atkins takes no action with respect to a keyboard event and

simply passes the event on for normal processing. Atkin, para. 37. Figure 6 illustrates this

aspect-- if the application does not support Unicode, the process ends without any further

processing. As explained by Atkin, if the application is not capable of handling Unicode inputs,

"**the operation terminates with keyboard events being processed in a normal manner** as if

the [input method editor] were not present." Atkin, para. 37 (emphasis added). Accordingly, the

providing of the non-Unicode input does not involve any sentinel value. Rather, Atkin simply

processes the input event "in a normal manner."

        Secondly, providing an application a non-Unicode input in no way teaches

preventing "an application from handling said user input event." Atkin teaches a "bypass" in

which an input method editor is provided to convert an input event into a Unicode value when a

Unicode capable application is to receive the input event. Atkin, para. 31. If the application at

issue is not Unicode capable, the bypass of Atkin is not utilized, and the system processes the

event "in a normal manner." Atkin, para. 37. Importantly, the system of Atkins takes no action

to prevent a non-Unicode capable application from processing the input event. If the application

can handle the input event, then such handling will proceed as normal. In short, Atkins, by

providing a non-Unicode value, in no way prevents "an application from handling" an event.

Third, the claim elements at issue provide the sentinel value "when one or more

of said text converting components are interested in performing a conversion action." Atkin,

however, provides a *converted Unicode value* when a converting component is interested in

performing a conversion action. As explained by Atkin, "If the application 410 is capable of

receiving Unicode input, the keyboard hook module 440 forwards the keyboard events to the

keystroke conversion module 460." Atkin, para 37. The keystroke conversion module can then

convert the keyboard event into its Unicode representation. Atkin, para. 39. Such a *converted*

Unicode value, of course, is not an obfuscated code. So, in contrast to the claims, Atkins teaches

providing a converted Unicode value when the conversion module is interested in performing a

conversion action, not an obfuscated code as required by claims 13, 25 and 30.

For at least these reasons, Atkin fails to teach or suggest each and every element

required by independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 30. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit

independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 30 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2- 12, which depend from claim

1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to

claim 1. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 14 - 24, which depend from claim 13,

are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim

13. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 26 - 29, which depend from claim 25, are in

condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 25.

Applicants further submit that dependent claims 31 and 32, which depend from claim 30, are in

condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 30.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, Claims 1 – 32 are in condition for allowance. If any

issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact

the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to

charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No.

19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/rhr/   Robert H. Reckers

Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547

220549v3